



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/575,197	05/23/2000	Kia Silverbrook	NPA001US	9186
24011 7590 12/23/2008 SILVERBROOK RESEARCH PTY LTD 393 DARLING STREET BALMAIN, 2041 AUSTRALIA				
EXAMINER				
COLBERT, ELLA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3696				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/23/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

09/575,197

Applicant(s)

SILVERBROOK ET AL.

Examiner

Ella Colbert

Art Unit

3696

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 8-18, 20-30 and 36-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 8-18, 20-30, and 36-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-3, 8-18, 20-30, and 36-46 are pending. Claims 1, 2, and 29 have been amended and claim 47 has been cancelled in this communication filed 03/02/08 entered as Response After Non-Final Action.
2. The claim objections for claims 1 and 36 have been overcome by Applicants' amendments to the claims and are hereby withdrawn.
3. The 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejections for claims 1 and 2 have been overcome by Applicants' amendments to the claims and are hereby withdrawn. The 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejection for claim 47 is moot since claim 47 has been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 2, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The Specification references "netpage pen" throughout the Specification and the claims recite "imaging pen". It is unclear from the Specification whether the "netpage pen" is the same as the "imaging pen" or they are each different pens.

Claims 3, 8—18, 20-28, 30, and 36-46 are also rejected because they depend from a rejected claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (GB 2226670A) Speiser in view of (US 6,330,976) Dymetman et al, hereafter Dymetman further in view of "A.T. Cross Company", here after "A.T. Cross".

Claims 1 and 29. Speiser discloses, A method of enabling payment of bills, the method including the steps of: providing a printed bill, the bill having printed thereon: human-readable information indicative of at least one parameter relating to a requested payment and coded data indicative of an identity of the bill and of a plurality of locations on the bill, at least some of the coded data being coincident with the information (page 6, paragraph 1- paragraph 3, and Fig. 1). Speiser failed to disclose, positioning an optically imaging pen operatively relative to the human-readable information. Dymetman discloses, positioning an optically imaging pen operatively relative to the human-readable information (col. 30, line 14-col. 32, line 67 and Fig. 15).

Spieser and Dymetman failed to disclose, sensing corresponding coincident data using the imaging pen; generating digital ink in the pen using the sensed coded data, said digital ink being a sequence of captured pen strokes, each stroke containing data

indicative of the identity of the bill and a position of the pen relative to the bill; sending the digital ink to a computer system such that the computer system can identify the at least one parameter relating to the requested payment. "A.T. Cross" discloses, positioning an optically imaging pen operatively relative to the human-readable information; sensing corresponding coincident data; generating digital ink in the pen using the sensed coded data, said digital ink being a sequence of captured pen strokes, each stroke containing data indicative of the identity of the bill and a position of the pen relative to the bill; sending the digital ink to a computer system such that the computer system can identify the at least one parameter relating to the requested payment (page 1, para. 1-page 2, para. 5). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify in Speiser with the teachings of "A.T. Cross" because such a modification would allow Speiser to know that the bill was paid in full and the consumer was given credit for paying the bill on time. The coded data being printed. Thus, the descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability.

Claims 2 and 30. Speiser failed to disclose, said at least one parameter relating to the requested payment is associated with at least one zone of the bill and in which the method includes identifying, in the computer system and from the zone indicated by the position of the imaging pen as indicated by the digital ink, said at least one parameter. Dymetman discloses, said at least one parameter relating to the requested payment is associated with at least one zone of the bill and in which the method includes identifying, in the computer system and from the zone indicated by the position of the

imaging pen as indicated by the digital ink, said at least one parameter (col. 17, line 3-col. 19, line 14). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Speiser with the teachings of Dymetman because such a modification would allow Speiser to have a location identifying the position of the pointer (imaging pen).

Claims 3 and 31. Spieser discloses, wherein each stroke of the digital ink includes movement of the pen relative to the bill, the pen generating the movement data using at least some of the coded data. "A.T. Cross" discloses "digital ink" (page 2, para. 6 and 7).

Claims 8-14 and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (GB 2226670A) Speiser, (US 6,330,976) Dymetman et al, hereafter Dymetman, and "A.T. Cross Company", hereafter "A.T. Cross", in view of (US 5,326,959) Perazza.

Claim 8. Spieser discloses, The method of claim 2 which the at least one parameter is an action parameter of the requested payment, the method including effecting, in the computer system, an operation in respect of the action parameter (Page 6, paragraph 1 and Page 7, paragraph 2).

Claims 9 and 37. Spieser discloses, the action parameter of the requested payment is selected from the group comprising: requesting that payment be made, specifying a payment amount or resetting the bill to an original state (Page 8, paragraph 1 (when the bill is generated there is a payment amount on the bill)).

Claim 10. Speiser and "A.T. Cross" failed to disclose, The method of claim 3 in which the at least one parameter is an option parameter of the requested payment, the method including identifying, in the computer system, that a hand-drawn mark has been entered on the bill by means of the pen and effecting, in the computer system, an operation associated with the option parameter. Perazza discloses, The method of claim 3 in which the at least one parameter is an option parameter of the requested payment, the method including identifying, in the computer system, that a hand-drawn mark has been entered on the bill by means of the pen and effecting, in the computer system, an operation associated with the option parameter (col. 16, lines 55-63). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify in Speiser with the teachings Perazza because such a modification would allow Speiser to identify that a hand-drawn mark was present on the bill and made by a sensing device (pen).

Claims 11 and 38. Spieser discloses, the option parameter is associated with at least one of: cardholder name, payment method or credit card type (Page 8, paragraph 2 –payment method which can be any type of method).

Claim 12. Speiser and "A.T. Cross" failed to disclose, The method of claim 3 entered by means of the pen and effecting, in the computer system, an operation associated with the text parameter. Perazza discloses, The method of claim 3 entered by means of the pen and effecting, in the computer system, an operation associated with the text parameter (col. 16, lines 55-63).

Claim 13. Speiser and "A.T. Cross" failed to disclose, The method of claim 12 which includes converting, in the computer system, the handwritten text data to computer text. Perazza discloses, The method of claim 12 which includes converting, in the computer system, the handwritten text data to computer text (col. 16, lines 55-63).

Claims 14 and 39. Speiser and "A. T. Cross" failed to disclose, the text parameter is associated with at least one of: a cardholder name, an amount paid or a card expiry date. Perazza discloses, the text parameter is associated with at least one of: a cardholder name, an amount paid or a card expiry date (col. 16, lines 28-63).

Claims 15-18 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (GB 2226670A) Speiser, (US 6,330,976) Dymetman et al, hereafter Dymetman, "A.T. Cross Company", hereafter "A.T. Cross" and (US 5,326,959) Perazza in view of (US 5,892,824) Beatson et al, hereafter Beatson.

Claim 15. Speiser, Dymetman, "A. T. Cross" and Perazza failed to disclose, The method of claim 3 in which the at least one parameter is an authorization parameter of the requested payment, the method including identifying, in the computer system, that a handwritten signature has been entered by means of the pen and effecting, in the computer system, an operation associated with the authorization parameter. Beatson discloses, The method of claim 3 in which the at least one parameter is an authorization parameter of the requested payment, the method including identifying, in the computer system, that a handwritten signature has been entered by means of the pen and

effecting, in the computer system, an operation associated with the authorization parameter (col. 8, lines 41-52).

Claim 16. Speiser, Dymetman, "A.T. Cross", and Perazza failed to disclose, The method of claim 15 which includes verifying, in the computer system, that the signature is that of a particular person. Beatson discloses, The method of claim 15 which includes verifying, in the computer system, that the signature is that of a particular person (col. 8, lines 41-52).

The Speiser, and Perazza patents lack a system that identifies that a hand-written signature has been entered by the sensing device and effecting the operation associated with the authorization parameter in claim 15 and the signature is that of a particular person in claim 16. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Speiser and Perazza systems to include the teachings of the Beatson patent to make the systems more user friendly, faster, more efficient, and more secure.

Claims 17 and 40. Speiser, Dymetman, and "A.T. Cross" failed to disclose, the authorization parameter is associated with payment authorization. Perazza discloses, the authorization parameter is associated with payment authorization (col. 16, lines 28-63) .

Claim 18. Speiser, Dymetman, and "A.T. Cross" failed to disclose, The method of claim 1, wherein the providing step includes receiving a request from a user to print the bill on demand, and printing the bill on demand. Perazza discloses, wherein the providing step

includes receiving a request from a user to print the bill on demand, and printing the bill on demand (col. 6, lines 53-65).

Claims 20-28 and 36, 41-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (GB 2226670A) Speiser, (US 6,330,976) Dymetman et al, hereafter Dymetman, "A.T.Cross", Perazza, (US 5,892,824) Beatson et al, hereafter Beatson,, (W0 99/50787) Xerox, (US 5,673,430) Story, (US 5,673,430) Mallicoat, and (10/94562A) Japanese Patent Abstract (Solution Portion of Abstract).

Claims 20 and 45. Speiser, Dymetman, "A.T. Cross", Perazza, and Beatson failed to disclose, wherein the coded data is invisible. Xerox discloses, wherein the coded data is invisible (Page 8, lines 23-25). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modified the Speiser, "A.T. Cross", Perazza, and Beatson patents to have invisible data so as not to interfere with other visible markings on the bill.

Claim 21. Speiser, Dymetman, and "A.T. Cross" failed to disclose, The method of claim 1 which includes retaining a retrievable record of each bill generated, each of the generated bills being receivable using its identity as contained in its coded data. Perazza discloses, The method of claim 1 which includes retaining a retrievable record of each bill generated, each of the generated bills being receivable using its identity as contained in its coded data (col. 6, lines 53-65).

Claim 22. Speiser, Dymetman, "A.T. Cross", Perazza, Beatson, and Xerox failed to disclose, The method of claim 1 which includes distributing a plurality of the bills using a

mixture of multicast and pointcast communications protocols. Story discloses, The method of claim 1 which includes distributing a plurality of the bills using a mixture of multicast and pointcast communications protocols (col. 3, lines 14-19). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Speiser, "A. T. Cross", Perazza, Beatson, and Xerox patents to use multicast and pointcast communications protocols to reduce the operating costs. Claims 23 and 42. Speiser, Dymetman, "A. T. Cross", Perazza, Beatson, Xerox, and Story failed to disclose, the sensing device contains an identification means which imparts a unique identity to the pen and identifies it as belonging to a particular person and in which the method includes monitoring, in the computer system, said identity. Mallicoat discloses, the sensing device contains an identification means which imparts a unique identity to the pen and identifies it as belonging to a particular person and in which the method includes monitoring, in the computer system, said identity (col. 6, line 66-col. 7, line 9). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Speiser, "A.T. Cross", Perazza, Beatson, Xerox, and Story patents to include the teachings of the Mallicoat patent to provide a more accurate and informative reading from the bill.

Claim 24. Speiser, Dymetman, and "A.T. Cross" failed to disclose, The method of claim 1 which includes providing all required information relating to the requested payment in the bill to eliminate the need for a separate display device. Perazza discloses, The method of claim 1 which includes providing all required information relating to the

requested payment in the bill to eliminate the need for a separate display device (col. 6, lines 62-66).

Claims 25 and 47. Speiser, Dymetman, "A.T. Cross", Perazza, Beatson, Xerox, Story, and Mallicoat failed to disclose, the bill is printed on multiple pages and in which the method includes binding the pages. Japanese Patent Abstract discloses, the bill is printed on multiple pages and in which the method includes binding the pages (Solution Portion of Abstract).

Claim 26. Speiser, Dymetman, and "A.T. Cross" failed to disclose, The method of claim 1 wherein:

the step of providing the bill is done by sending the bill by mail. Perazza discloses, The method of claim 1 wherein: the step of providing the bill is done by sending the bill by mail (col. 3, lines 53-65). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Speiser, "A.T.Cross", Perazza, Beatson, Xerox, Story, and Mallicoat patents to have a means of binding a bill having multiple pages so that the various pages would remain together and reduce the opportunity for the pages to become separated or lost.

Claim 27. Speiser, Dymetman, and "A.T. Cross" failed to disclose, The method of claim 1, further including the step of causing a printer to print a payment receipt after a payment has been completed. Perazza discloses, The method of claim 1, further including the step of causing a printer to print a payment receipt after a payment has been completed (col. 6, lines 53-65).

Claims 28 and 44. Speiser, Dymetman, and "A.T. Cross" failed to disclose, wherein the payment receipt comprises coded data indicative of the identity of the receipt. Perazza discloses, wherein the payment receipt comprises coded data indicative of the identity of the receipt (col. 6, lines 53-65).

Claim 36. Speiser, Dymetman, and "A.T. Cross" failed to disclose, The system of claim 29 in which said at least one parameter of the requested payment is selected from the group comprising an action parameter of the requested payment, an option parameter of the requested payment, a text parameter of the requested payment, or an authorization parameter of the requested payment. Perazza discloses, The system of claim 29 in which said at least one parameter of the requested payment is selected from the group comprising an action parameter of the requested payment, an option parameter of the requested payment, a text parameter of the requested payment, or an authorization parameter of the requested payment (col. 16, lines 28-48).

Claim 41. Speiser, Dymetman, "A.T. Cross", Perazza, and Beatson failed to disclose, The system of claim 31 in which the pen includes a marking nib. Xerox discloses, The system of claim 31 in which the pen includes a marking nib (505, Page 14, lines 10-19). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Speiser, Perazza, and Beatson patents to have a pen with a nib so that if marks are necessary on the bill, they can be made at the time of reading the bill with the sensing device.

Claim 43. Speiser, Dymetman, and "A.T. Cross" failed to disclose, The system of claim 29 in which the bill is printed on a surface of a surface defining means and in which the

system includes a printer for printing the bill on demand. Perazza discloses, The system of claim 29 in which the bill is printed on a surface of a surface defining means and in which the system includes a printer for printing the bill on demand (col. 6, lines 53-65).

Claim 46. Speiser, Dymetman, and "A.T. Cross" failed to disclose, The system of claim 29 which includes a database for keeping a retrievable record of each bill generated, each bill being retrievable by using its identity as included in its coded data. Perazza discloses, The system of claim 29 which includes a database for keeping a retrievable record of each bill generated, each bill being retrievable by using its identity as included in its coded data (col. 7, lines 9-23).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 03/02/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Issue no. 1: Applicants' argue: There is nothing in Speiser that teaches "coded data indicative of a plurality of locations on the bill and the second identification symbol taught by Speiser is evidently not an indication of a plurality of locations on the bill has been considered but is not persuasive. Response: A plurality of locations is interpreted as more than one location. Therefore, two symbols, a barcode and/or magnetic characters and/or optical characters, or any other identification means readable by man or machine is interpreted as a plurality of locations of coded data on the bill in the Speiser reference.

Issue no. 2: Applicants' argue: Cross does not use optical imaging of printed coded data to generate digital ink has been considered but is not persuasive.

Response: Cross does store the handprint in a digital ink in memory and has a Digital Ink Module TM that enables automated forms processing using hand-held devices and mentions a cross pen computing group. Therefore, it is interpreted that Cross has the capability to use optical imaging of printed coded data. It is not interpreted that the claim limitations recite "optical imaging of printed coded data to generate digital ink".

Claim 1 recites "generating digital ink in the pen using the sensed coded data, said digital ink being a sequence of captured pen strokes, each stroke containing data indicative of the identity of the bill and a position of the pen relative to the bill".

Therefore, it is interpreted that Cross discloses this claim limitation.

Issue no. 3: Applicants' argue: The Applicants' submit that the teaching of Cross would not lead the skilled person to replace Speiser's barcode with printed coded data enabling the generation of digital ink in an optically imaging pen, which senses coded data during handwritten input on the bill has been considered but is not persuasive.

Response: Since each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, albeit shown in separate references, the difference between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rests not on any individual element or function but in the very combination itself. That is the substitution of the Cross Pen computing Cross Pad digital notepad and IBM Pen Solutions, and Digital Ink solution of Reference B for the portion of the blank bill that passes through its device which reads magnetic ink and identifies the particular consumer to whom the bill belongs and the two different

identification symbols, i.e. bar code and/or magnetic characters and/or optical characters, or any other identification means readable by man or machine of Reference A. Thus, the simple substitution of one known element for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

Also see, *In re Nilssen* (CAFC) 7 USPQ2d 1500 (7/13/1988). "Nilssen urges this court to establish a "reality-based" definition whereby, in effect, references may not be combined to formulate obviousness rejections absent an express suggestion in one prior art reference to look to another specific reference. We reject that recommendation as contrary to our precedent which holds that for the purpose of combining references, those references need not explicitly suggest combining teachings, much less specific references." See, e.g., *In re Semaker*, 702 F.2d 989, 995, 217 USPQ 1, 6 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 1395, 170 USPQ 209, 212 (CCPA 1971).

"An essential purpose of patent examination is to fashion claims that are precise, clear, correct, and unambiguous. Only in this way can uncertainties of claim scope be removed ...". *In re Zletz* 13 USPQ2d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ella Colbert whose telephone number is 571-272-6741. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday, 5:30AM-3:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dixon Thomas can be reached on 571-272-6803. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ella Colbert/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3696

December 22, 2008

Application Number**Application/Control No.**

09/575,197

**Applicant(s)/Patent under
Reexamination**

SILVERBROOK ET AL.

Examiner

Ella Colbert

Art Unit

3696